DNA 5334F

STRESS WAVE INTERACTIONS WITH TUNNELS BURIED IN WELL-CHARACTERIZED JOINTED MEDIA

Martin Rosenblatt

Larry A. DeAngelo

California Research and Technology, Inc.

6269 Variel Avenue

Woodland Hills, California 91367

1 June 1980

Final Report for Period 4 May 1977—1 June 1980

CONTRACT Nos. DNA 001-77-C-0203
DNA 001-79-C-0278

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

DDC FILE COPY

Prepared for

Director

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Washington, D. C. 20305

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
DNA 5334F	AD-A10 698	

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
STRESS WAVE INTERACTIONS WITH TUNNELS BURIED IN WELL-CHARACTERIZED JOINTED MEDIA	Final Report for period 4 May 77 — 1 June 80
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
	CRT-3170F

7. AUTHOR(s)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
Martin Rosenblatt Larry A. DeAngelo	DNA 001-77-C-0203 DNA 001-79-C-0278

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
California Research & Technology, Inc. 6269 Variel Avenue Woodland Hills, California 91367	Subtasks Y99QAXSC061-51 Y99QAXSC061-66

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Director Defense Nuclear Agency Washington, DC 20305	1 June 1980
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
	64

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	UNCLASSIFIED
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Joints	Deeply Buried Structures
Block Motion	Numerical Simulation
Buried Tunnels	Computer Codes

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

For the DIABLO HAWK underground nuclear test, several small-scale tunnels were constructed in jointed rock simulant material and stress loaded to approximately 0.8 kbar = 11.6 ksi. These tunnel response tests represented an opportunity to evaluate whether successful pre-shot predictions of tunnel closure and block motion could be made for tunnels buried in a well-characterized jointed media. In this report, numerical simulation predictions using computer code techniques which explicitly treat the idealized joints —

DD 1473

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. Abstract (continued)

are described and compared to data from the recovered experimental model. The
tunnel closure predictions and the predicted locations of block motion are
in reasonable agreement with some experimental data.

Other aspects of the study included:

● development and application of an analytical technique for
  predicting joint activation conditions (i.e., block motions)
  for specified joint orientations and locations near the
  tunnel surface,

● calculations and comparisons of tunnel response to dynamic
  and quasi-static stress loads, and

● investigation of the effects of joint friction on tunnel
  damage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (continued)

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1.1 BACKGROUND

All rock masses contain large numbers of planar discontinuities or joints. These joints often react to an applied stress quite differently than the surrounding material and there is both experimental (Ref. 1) and theoretical (Refs. 2, 3) evidence to suggest that sliding motion across these joints should be one of the important considerations involved in designing underground structures which are to survive nuclear and/or conventional explosions.

In the recent DIABLO HAWK underground nuclear test, SRI International fielded several laboratory-scale structures in jointed rock simulant (Ref. 4). Figure 1 shows the general model designs. The jointed rock models are 18" and 30" in diameter, with 3" and 5" diameter tunnels, respectively. The SRI small-scale jointed structures experiment provides an opportunity for examining the influence of highly idealized jointed arrays on tunnel closure and damage characteristics.

There are both continuum and explicit approaches for predicting tunnel closure and damage in jointed media. In the continuum approach, the overall mechanical properties of the field are synthesized from the properties of the intact rock and the properties and arrangement of the joints; for example, stiffnesses and strengths used in the continuum model are lower than the intact rock properties. In the explicit approach, the properties and arrangement of individual blocks and joints are individually and explicitly modeled and used to calculate tunnel response to loading. Both of these treatments have important limitations: The rationale for choosing a set of degraded

5

(Working Point)

Joint Angle

W.P.

(a) SINGLE JOINT SET, 0°, 45° or 90°

(b) SINGLE JOINT SET PERPENDICULAR TO TUNNEL AXIS

W.P.

45 -45

(c) DOUBLE ORTHOGONAL JOINT SETS WITH COARSE JOINT SPACING IN OUTER ANNULUS ALSO FIELDED WITH JOINTS ORIENTED AT 0° AND 90° TO W.P.

W.P.

45 -45

(d) DOUBLE ORTHOGONAL JOINT SETS WITH UNIFORM JOINT SPACING

W.P.

Figure 1. JOINTING ARRANGEMENT FOR MODELS ASSEMBLED FROM 16A ROCK SIMULANT

The models shown have a nominal diameter of 18 inches with a 3-inch diameter tunnel. Some models will be 30 inches in diameter with a 5-inch diameter tunnel. (From Reference 4.)

6

properties in the continuum approach is usually hard to justify, and this approach precludes discontinuities in displacements across joints, which may be a critical omission. The properties of joints in the explicit approach are hard to measure, and the arrangement of joints in a real field around a real tunnel can only be estimated.

1.2 OBJECTIVE AND APPROACH

The objective of this study is to examine the influence of the joints on tunnel closure and damage using numerical techniques which explicitly treat the idealized joints in the SRI structure.

The approach involves three related aspects:

1. Joint Activation.

    An analytical closed form solution is derived for the initiation or activation of relative motion across a joint. The joint activation depends on (a) the relative orientation of the joint and the tunnel surface intersected by the joint, (b) the magnitude and propagation direction of the stress wave encompassing the tunnel, and (c) the shear stress on the joint which must exceed a critical value which depends on the normal stress across the joint as well as on surface roughness.

    In Section 2, the joint activation solution is derived and applied to the SRI small-scale models to estimate (a) the areas on the tunnel surface where joint activation is likely to occur, (b) the stress levels which are necessary to activate joints of various orientations, and (c) the sensitivity of joint activation to material properties.

2. **Dynamic Tunnel Response Cases.**

   In the SRI small-scale models with tunnel diameters of
   3", the transit time across this characteristic dimen-
   sion is only 22 μsec in the 16A rock simulant material.
   Thus, since the rise times to peak stresses of 0.8 kbar
   in the DIABLO HAWK event are 5-10 msec, these small-
   scale structures are actually loaded (and unloaded) in
   a quasi-static fashion. Full-scale tunnels may be
   loaded more dynamically, therefore the effects of
   dynamic loading on small-scale tunnels buried in jointed
   media are analyzed using six plane strain computer code
   simulations with dynamic loading times of 100-400 μsec.
   These cases also vary the assumed joint and tensile
   strength properties of the rock simulant. The WAVE-L
   Lagrangian code is used; the basic formulation is
   similar to the HEMP code (Ref. 5). The numerical
   solutions and material properties are described in
   Section 3.

3. **Quasi-Static Tunnel Response Prediction For a Small-Scale
   Structure Loaded to 0.8 kbar During the DIABLO HAWK
   Event.**

   A numerical simulation prediction of tunnel closure and
   damage is made and compared with a fielded small-scale
   SRI model (the model has a 3" tunnel diameter with ½"
   joint spacings, model # 3-H-2-1).

   The quasi-static solution technique and the calculational-
   experimental comparisons are described in Section 4.

1.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1.3.1 Joint Activation

Although the response of a tunnel in a jointed medium must be solved numerically, the conditions that will <u>initiate joint slipping</u> can be analyzed in closed form if we assume an elastic media with joints, and a far field stress state of uniaxial strain with a stress loading of σ_{load}.

Figure 2 shows the loading stress (σ_{load}) required to activate a joint oriented at $\alpha = 0$, $45°$, and $90°$ as a function of the angle (β) where the joint intersects the tunnel surface. Thus a joint oriented at $\alpha = 45°$ will require a loading stress of .06 kbar (900 psi) to become activated if this joint intersects the tunnel surface at $\beta = 100°$ (see the following sketch and Figure 2).

Joint oriented at 45°

$\alpha = 45°$

$\beta = 100°$

W.P.

Tunnel

(Unlined tunnel approximation is valid because joint activation involves only small strains and thus the backpacking in the tunnel will not contribute a significant stress to the tunnel surface.)

Symmetrical Joint
Behavior for $\beta + 180°$

9

CALIFORNIA RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, INC.
JOINT ACTIVATION ANALYSIS

CASE P1 ALPHA= 0.00

Joint
Activation

SIGMA LOAD (mbar)
BETA (DEG)

CASE P1 ALPHA= 45.00

Joint
Activation

SIGMA LOAD
BETA (DEG)

CASE P1 ALPHA= 90.00

SIGMA LOAD
BETA (DEG)

CASE P1 ALPHA= -45.00

SIGMA LOAD
BETA (DEG)

Note that for each joint orientation (α), the shaded region on Figure 2 shows the angles (θ) on the tunnel surface where joint activation is possible as a function of loading stress (σ_{load}). Note that symmetry implies equivalent tunnel behavior at angles of $\theta + 180°$. Joints will not slip outside of these shaded regions. The tunnel angles, θ, associated with absolute minimums in loading stress (σ_{load}) necessary for joint activation are indicated in Table 1. However, note that the activation stress curves (Figure 2) are relatively flat bottomed; and therefore, joint activation can occur over a fairly wide range in tunnel angles with only a small increase in loading.

Table 1.   Tunnel Angles (θ) for Minimum Loading
Stress for Various Joint Orientations (α).

Joint Orientation	Tunnel Angles for Minimum Loading Stress*		
α degree	θ degree	σ_{load} kbar	psi
0	67, 113	.068	986
45	103	.059	856
90	41, 139	.162	2350
45	76, 103	.059	856

*Representative constitutive properties are used
(Case P1):   Joint Cohesion (τ_0)=.04 kbar, Friction
Angle (ϕ) 33°, Material Poisson's Ratio (ν)=.25.

Figure 3 shows the areas on the tunnel surface where joint activation (for a single joint) could occur for σ_{load} = .5 kbar.

11

Figure 3. Regions of Possible Joint Activation for a .5 kbar Stress Load Interacting with Joint Oriented at ι = 0°, 45°, 90°, and ±45°. (Case P1, σ_o = .04 kbar, ϕ = 33°, μ = .25)

Joint Orientations

$\iota = 45°$

$\iota = 90°$

$\iota = 0°$

$\iota = ±45°$

At Ends of Activation Regions, S_{load} = .5 bar is Required for Activation.

Regions of Possible Joint Activation

Location of Joints Requiring Maximum S_{load} for Activation

W.P.

12

All the joint orientations in the SRI experiment are shown for a representative set of joint and earth media properties. (Variations in the joint and earth media constitutive properties are illustrated in Section 2.)

1.3.2 Dynamic Response Cases

Six WAVE-L numerical simulations (Table 3) were performed involving 100-400 μsec stress rise times to a peak loading stress of 0.8 kbar on the SRI 3" diameter models. The wave transit time across the 3" tunnel opening is ~22 μsec, therefore, the dynamic tunnel response characteristics could be investigated.

The tensile stress history near the tunnel crown is strongly dependent on the stress wave rise time for times corresponding to a few transit times across the tunnel diameter. A stress wave rise time of 100 μsec (~5 transit times) caused a peak tensile stress of almost 150 bars. In the quasi-static loading case without joint sliding, no tensile stress developed near the crown.

Tensile fracture of the material near the tunnel surface is also related to the relative displacements* across the joints. When slipping occurs across joints, the plates of rock separated by the joints can act as unsupported beams due to the presence of the unlined tunnel. The resulting beam bending can lead to tensile stresses and fracture.

1.3.3 Quasi-Static Tunnel Response Prediction

The quasi-static solution technique is described in Section 4. Numerical simulation predictions using this technique were made for a fielded small-scale (3" diameter tunnel) SRI model. The

*The relative displacement or slipping across a joint is measured by the current distance between two points which were initially touching each other on opposite faces of the joint.

calculation predictions were made prior to excavation and examin-
ation of the model.

Figure 4 shows a comparison of the predicted tunnel closure
(as a % of the diameter) versus tunnel angle, β. The agreement
is reasonable except near the crown-invert ($\beta = 0°$ and $180°$).
The maximum predicted closure is 1.2% at $\beta = 30°$. The experi-
mental data show a maximum 1.6% closure at the crown-invert
compared to a 0.5% predicted value at the crown-invert. This
difference may be due to the moderate sliding on the joints and
associated tensile failure and relaxation which occurs in the
calculation, but not in the experiment.

In the post-shot experimental model, there was deformation
of a thin (.003 inch) stainless steel tunnel liner which surrounds
the foam filler. This liner may have inhibited sliding along the
joints. The observed liner deformation is associated with the
joints which are predicted to slide the most; thus, some "block
motion" appears to have occurred.

It is concluded that tunnel closure in a well-characterized
jointed media could be predicted using existing computer code
techniques involving explicit descriptions of joint locations,
orientations, and friction properties. Also, because of the
important role joint (and fault) motion plays in determining
damage to tunnel liners and nearby earth material, it is felt
that continuum approaches to predicting tunnel closure and damage
might not be as useful.

14

Figure .. Comparison of Experimental Data and Prediction for the Tunnel Closure $(\frac{\Delta D}{D})$ versus Tunnel Angle for the Small-Scale DIABLO HAWK Model S-D1-2-5.

SECTION 2

JOINT ACTIVATION ANALYSIS

The necessary conditions for a joint or block to begin slip-
ping depend on the relative orientation of the joint, the tunnel
surface, and the stress wave, as indicated in the following
sketch:

α is the joint orienta-
tion angle

β is the tunnel angle
(angle where joint
intersects tunnel)

λ is the angle between
the joint and the
normal to the tunnel
surface, $\lambda = \beta - \alpha$

Joint slippage will occur when the shear stress (τ) on the joint
exceeds a critical value, τ_{max}. This value depends on the normal
stress (σ_n) across the joint as well as on the surface roughness.
Prior to joint activation, the earth media around the tunnel is
assumed to respond elastically and statically to a uniaxial strain
load from a (quasi-static) planar wave.

The key characteristics of interest, with respect to *joint activation* are:

- the areas on the tunnel surface where joint activation is likely to occur,

- the stress levels which are necessary to activate joints of various orientations,

- the sensitivity of joint activation to material properties.

The determination of these characteristics involves the following elements:

1. The *static tangential stress* field on the unlined tunnel surface (this stress field is shown in Figure 5 as a ratio with the loading stress, i.e., $\sigma_\theta/\sigma_{load}$).

2. The *joint constitutive model* (i.e., we assume $\tau_{max} = \tau_o + (\tan \phi)\sigma_n$ where τ_o and ϕ are experimentally determined parameters).

3. The *far field stress load* (σ^a_{load}) *for joint activation* as a function of joint orientation (α), position on the tunnel (β), and material properties.

The activation stress load relationship (derived in Appendix A) is

$$\sigma^a_{load} = \frac{(2\tau_o\cos\phi)/(\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin\phi)}{2 - [1 + 2\cos(2\beta)]\,\frac{[1-2\nu]}{[1-\nu]}} \tag{1}$$

where

$\psi = |\alpha-\beta|$ (see sketch on previous page)

τ_o and ϕ are joint constitutive parameters

ν is the Poisson's Ratio for the earth material

17

$$\Lambda(\beta) = \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_{\text{load}}} = -[1 + 2\cos(2\beta)] \left\{\frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu}\right\}$$

Figure 5. Static Tangential Stress Field (σ_2) from a Planar Loading Wave (σ_{load}) as a Function of Tunnel Angle (β) for Two Values of Poisson's Ratio (ν).

18

Note that Equation 1 shows that τ_o, ϕ, and ν are the constitutive properties of interest for joint activation. Table 2 lists the numerical values of these properties which were used to calculate joint activation relationships.

Table 2. Joint and Earth Media Constitutive Properties

	Joint			Earth Media
Case	Cohesion*, τ_o		Friction Angle*	Poisson's Ratio
	kbar	psi	ϕ (degrees)	ν
P1	.04	580	33	.25
P2	.08	1160	33	.25
P3	.02	290	33	.25
P4	.04	580	0	.25
P5	.04	580	33	.40

*The joint cohesion (τ_o) and friction angle (ϕ) are related to the unconfined compressive strength (σ_u) of the earth media by

$$\sigma_u = \frac{2\tau_o \cos\phi}{1 - \sin\phi}$$

Figure 2 and Figures 6 to 9 show the variations in σ_{load} versus tunnel angle (α) for the joint and earth media property variations indicated in Table 2. Figure 3 and Figures 10 to 13 show the corresponding regions on the tunnel surface where joint activation is possible for σ_{load} = .5 kbar.

19

Figure 6. Joint Activation Stress Loads for Various Joint Orientations (γ) as a Function of tunnel Angle (β) for Constitutive Property Case P2 ($r_o = .06$, $z = 33°$, $z = .25$).

CALIFORNIA RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, INC.
JOINT ACTIVATION ANALYSIS

CASE P3 ALPHA= 0.00

CASE P3 ALPHA= 45.00

CASE P3 ALPHA= 90.00

CASE P3 ALPHA= -45.00

SIGMA LOAD (kb)

BETA (DEG)

Figure .. Joint Activation Stress Loads for Various Joint Orientations (,) as a Function of Joint Angle ( ) for Constitutive Property Case P3 (ϵ_o = .02, = $33°$, = .25).

21

CALIFORNIA RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, INC.
JOINT ACTIVATION ANALYSIS

Figure 2. Joint Activation Stress Loads for Various Joint Orientations (as a function of Euler angle β) for Constitutive Property Case P4 (α = 0°, 45°, 90°, -45°)

Figure 9. Joint activation stress (load) for various joint orientations (τ) as a function of tunnel angles (β) for constitutive property case P5 ($\sigma_o = .04$ kbar, $\phi = 33°$, $\mu = .4$)

$\mu = -45°$

$\mu = 90°$

$\mu = 45°$

$\mu = 0°$

Location of Joints
Possible Joint
Load Application

Case P1 (σ_o = .04 kbar, ϕ = 33°, ν = .25)

Case P2 (σ_o = .06 kbar, ϕ = 33°, ν = .25)

Figure 10. Geometry of Possible Joint Activation for a Variation in Joint Location (σ_{load} = .5 kbar).

Figure 11. Regions of Possible Joint Activation for a Variation in Joint Cohesion, C_o (C_{load} = .5 kbar).

Case P3 (C_o = .04 kbar, ϕ = 33°, λ = .25)

Case P4 (C_o = .04 kbar, ϕ = 0°, λ = .25)

Figure 12. Regions of Possible Joint Activation for a Variation of Friction Angle, ϕ (σ_{load} = .5 kbar).

$, = \cdot 45°$

$, = 90°$

$, = 45°$

$= 0°$

Case P1 ($G_o = .04$ kbar, $ = 33°$, $= .25$)

Case P5 ($_o = .04$ kbar, $ = 33°$, $ = .40$)

Location of Joints Requiring load Activation

Regions of Possible Joint Activation

Figure 13. Regions of Possible Joint Activation for a Variation in Poisson's Ratio, ($_{load} = .5$ kbar).

27

Comparisons of the results from the constitutive property cases P1 to P5 leads to the following conclusions:

1. Increasing (or decreasing) the cohesion, τ_o, increases (or decreases) the minimun loading stress for joint activation while leaving unchanged the tunnel angles (β) where joint activation is most likely.

2. Reducing the fiction angle to $\phi = 0$, thereby simulating a von Mises limiting shear strength of τ_o, causes an expansion of the possible joint activation region.

3. Varying Poisson's Ratio for the earth media from $\nu = .25$ to $\nu = .40$ causes an expansion of the possible joint activation region.

SECTION 3

DYNAMIC RESPONSE CASES

In the DIABLO HAWK experiment, the stress wave time history involves rise times to a peak stress of ∿0.8 kbars in 5-10 msec. In Section 4, quasi-static techniques are used to treat this rise

Time After Wave Arrival at 0.8 Kbar Stress Range

time, which is quite long with respect to tunnel response. In Section 3.1, material properties for all the cases are described. In Section 3.2, six numerical calculations involving much shorter rise times of between 100 and 400 μsec are described and compared.

3.1 MATERIAL PROPERTIES

16A Rock Simulant

In the small-scale experiments, the jointed media is 16A rock simulant. The elastic-plastic properties are modeled with the following parameters:

Bulk Modulus	K = .131 Mbar	
Shear Modulus	G = .086 Mbar	
∴ Poisson's Ratio	ν = .23	
Density	ρ_o = 2.0 gm/cm^3	
Yield Strength	Y = .22 kbar + 1.2P, where P is pressure. A Prandtl-Reuss non-associated flow rule is assumed.	

Tensile failure is modeled in most of the solutions using a tensile failure model which permits oriented cracks to develop (Ref. 6). A 500 psi = 34.5 bar tensile strength was measured in a simple tensile test (Ref. 7) on a 16A rock simulant sample. Most of our solutions use this value; in one of the cases, the tensile strength is reduced to 6.9 bars (100 psi) as a sensitivity study.

In two of the cases, frictional forces along the sliding joints are included. In these situations the joint constitutive model is specified by:

$$\tau_{max} = \tau_o + \mu \sigma_n = \tau_o + (\tan\phi)\sigma_n$$

where

$$\tau_{max} = \text{maximum allowable shear stress on joint}$$

σ_n = normal stress on joint

τ_o = the joint cohesion

μ = (tanϕ) is the coefficient of friction and ϕ
is the angle of friction

The experimental values (Ref. 7) are

τ_o = 10 psi

ϕ = 30°

The Drucker-Prager plastic yield surface assumed for the 16A rock simulant material does <u>not</u> include shear strength softening (i.e., reduction of the yield strength) due to plastic shear deformation or tensile cracking. This may be significant in this application because the uniaxial strain loading path for this material is close to the yield surface. Therefore, small changes in the failure surface may lead to large changes in the plastic response of the 16A rock simulant.

Foam Filler

The tunnel is filled with a low density elastic-plastic foam with the following properties:

Bulk Modulus	K = 1.75 kbar
Shear Modulus	G = 2.5 kbar
Density	ρ_o = .05 gm/cm^3
Von Mises Yield Strength	Y = 500 psi = 0.34 kbar

31

3.2 CASE COMPARISONS FOR THE 0.8 KBAR DYNAMICALLY LOADED TUNNELS

Table 3 lists the joint geometry, tensile limit, rise time, and material model for the six dynamic loading cases. In all cases the tunnel is filled with low density foam with properties described in Section 3.1.

The loading is a plane wave of 0.8 kbar magnitude. The stress increases linearly from 0 to 0.8 kbar over a characteristic rise time τ_r, (100 μsec in most of these cases). A constant pressure of 0.8 bar is maintained after τ_r. The far-field condition of the pulse (i.e., prior to interaction with the tunnel) is uniaxial strain.

3.2.1 Effect of Loading Rise Time

In the first three cases, the rock media is modeled as an elastic-plastic media with no joints or tensile failure. Cases 1, 2, and 3 differ in their loading rise times (τ_r = 100, 200, and 400 μsec). Cases 4, 5, and 6 have joints which are perpendicular to the wave vector as indicated in Table 3; in these cases, the joint properties and tensile strength of the media are varied.

Figure 14 shows particle velocity (upper part of figure) and principal stress (lower part) fields at 62 μsec for Case 1. Note that the velocity and stress fields have a plane of symmetry which separates the two fields. The scale bars for the velocity vectors and principal stresses are shown on this figure. The following sketch defines the plotting convention for the principal stress:

32

Table 3. The Dynamic Loading Cases

Case	Joints	Tensile Limit	Rise Time τ_r
1	None	None	100 µsec
2	None	None	200 µsec
3	None	None	400 µsec
4	Frictionless $\perp$ to Wave Vector	100 psi (6.9 bars)	100 µsec
5	Frictionless $\perp$ to Wave Vector	500 psi (34.5 bars)	100 µsec
6	With Friction ($\tau_{max} = 10$ psi $+ .6\ \sigma_n$) $\perp$ to Wave Vector	500 psi (34.5 bars)	100 µsec

Stress
Wave
Front

Wave
W.P.   Vector
*

Cases 4, 5, 6

50 ft/sec

0.5 kbar

Velocity Field ——

Stress Field ——

Figure 14.   Particle Velocity and Principal Stress Fields at 62 μsec for the
Elastic-Plastic Media Model (Case 1, 0.8 kbar Loading in 100 μsec).

34

The loading wave approaches the tunnel from the left. By 62 μsec,
the tunnel is responding very non-symmetrically. Note that one
principal stress is nearly zero near the tunnel boundary, and the
tangential stress is largest near the springline of the tunnel.

Figure 14 shows that one of the principal stresses is
slightly tensile near the tunnel crown (left side of tunnel).
Figure 15 shows the tensile stress history at the crown for
cases 1, 2, and 3. The tensile response near the crown is clearly
dependent on the stress wave rise time for times of a few hundred
microseconds and less; a sound wave crosses the characteristic
tunnel diameter in about 22 μsec. In the quasi-static solution
without joint activation (see Section 4), there was no tensile
stress at the crown.

3.2.2 Effects of Rock Tensile Strength and Joint Shear Strength

The WAVE-L code has the capacity to allow the formation of
tensile cracks, to calculate the width of the cracks, and to
adjust stresses adjacent to the cracks using elastic stress-strain
relationships. After a cell has cracked, no tensile stress across
the crack is permitted, and no shear stresses are permitted on
the crack if the crack is open (the width of the crack is con-
tinuously monitored). These stress adjustments are important
because a crack frequently alters the local stress field in such
a way as to enhance its own growth; thus, any realistic method
of predicting crack growth must consider the altered stress field.
Each computational cell is allowed to develop up to two cracks.
If a third crack forms, the cell is considered to be completely
shattered, and no tension at all is thereafter allowed. The
general treatment of tensile failure and the plotting conventions
used to indicate the cracked cells in the computational grid
plots are illustrated in Figure 16.

Figure 15.   Tensile Stress versus Time at the Tunnel Crown for Various
Stress Wave Rise Times (t_r) to a Maximum Load of 0.8 kbar.

Tensile stresses (σ) exceed the critical tensile failure criterion in the indicated principal stress direction, $\sigma > \sigma_c$.

Plane which experiences tensile failure.

Crack opens and relieves the tensile stress such that no forces or tractions exist on the crack surfaces; i.e., zero normal and shear stress on the crack surface.

In the directions perpendicular to the crack surface, the material can maintain tensile stresses until the critical tensile failure criterion is exceeded and a new crack is formed.

Plotting Convention:

Single crack in x-y plane. The line is plotted in the direction of the crack (normal to the principal stress causing the crack).

Out-of-plane crack; i.e., $\sigma_{zz} > \sigma_c$ caused the crack.

Out-of-plane and x-y plane crack.

Two x-y plane cracks; only out-of-plane tension is permitted.

Completely fractured - no tension permitted.

Figure 16. Treatment of Tensile Cracks in WAVE-L Code.

In Cases 4 and 5 the sensitivity of the solution to varia-
tions in the tensile strength of the rock medium is examined.
In Case 4, the 16A rock simulant has a tensile strength of
6.9 bars (= 100 psi); in Case 5, a strength of 34.5 bars
(= 500 psi) is used. The effect on the tensile crack formation
is shown in Figures 17 and 18 which show these two cases at two
different times.

Case 6 implements all the material and joint properties used
in the quasi-static DIABLO HAWK simulation (Section 4), including
friction along the joints. The presence of the friction is the
only difference between Case 5 and 6. The final crack pattern in
Case 6 is compared to Case 5 in Figure 19. Friction, working to
support slip along the joints, reduces the degree of crack cracking.

Tensile cracking of the material near the tunnel surface is
closely related to the relative slide displacements across the
joints. When slipping occurs across joints, the plates of rock
separated by the joints can act as unsupported beams due to the
presence of the unlined tunnel. The resulting beam bending leads
to tensile stresses and fracture.

Figure 12. Tensile Crack Configuration at t = 55 usec for Tensile Strength
of 100 psi and 500 psi (Cases 4 and 5; 0.8 kbar = 11.6 ksi
stress loading in 100 usec).

Case 4

Joints

Tensile Strength = 6.9 bars = 100 psi

Wave Vector →

Y CM

X CM

Case 5

Tensile Strength = 34.5 bars = 500 psi

Wave Vector →

Y CM

X CM

−7 −6 −5 −4 −3 −2 −1   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

128.5 USEC

Figure 18.   Tensile Crack Configuration at t = 127 usec for Tensile Strength of 100 psi and 500 psi (Cases 4 and 5; 0.8 kbar = 11.6 ksi Stress Loading in 100 usec).

40

Figure 19. Tensile Crack Configuration at t = 127 μsec for a Variation
of Friction (Case 6) versus Frictionless (Case 5) Joints
(0.8 kbar = 11.6 ksi Stress Loading in 100 μsec).

41

SECTION 4

DIABLO HAWK SMALL-SCALE STRUCTURE PREDICTION CASE

This numerical simulation was intended to match a fielded
small-scale SRI model. The calculation results were obtained
prior to the excavation of the model. The particular model is
designated as S-D1-2-5 by SRI.

4.1 PROBLEM CONFIGURATION

The tunnel diameter is 3". Joint spacing is nominally ½"
(0.47"). The boundaries of the numerical grid are at 9.45" from
the tunnel center (6.3 times the tunnel radius), which is suf-
ficient to minimize edge effects in the region of interest. The
joint geometry is shown with the initial computational grid in
Figure 20.

Material properties of the 16A rock simulant and foam filler
are described in Section 3.1. The frictional properties of the
joints are also discussed in that section.

The tunnel and jointed media are subjected to a planar stress
wave of 0.8 kbar peak amplitude. The rise time is 5-10 msec
and decay 100 msec. These times are very long compared to
the 22 μsec sound wave transit time across the tunnel diameter
in the 16A material. The actual tunnel, therefore, is in a
"quasi-static" state.

4.2 QUASI-STATIC SOLUTION TECHNIQUE

The quasi-static solution is found as indicated on Figure 21:

1. Obtain the elastic solution to a tunnel loaded with
   the 0.8 kbar (far-field uniaxial strain) stresses.

Figure 33. Initial Conditions and computational grid for the Joints being Perpendicular to the Wave Vector (Using WES Material Properties).

1. OBTAIN STATIC
   ELASTIC SOLUTION

0.8 kbar
stress
load

2. OBTAIN QUASI-STATIC
   ELASTIC-PLASTIC
   SOLUTION

Plastic
Deformation
Region

3. OBTAIN QUASI-STATIC
   SOLUTION INCLUDING
   JOINTS AND ALLOWING
   SLIDING AND TENSILE
   FAILURE

Joints with
Friction

Tensile
Cracking

Figure 21. Successive Steps in Quasi-Static Numerical Simulation Technique.

44

2. Using the elastic solution as initial conditions,
    activate the elastic-plastic material model and
    calculate the dynamics until a steady state
    solution is obtained.

3. Using this elastic-plastic solution as initial
    conditions, a calculation is performed with the
    slide lines introduced to model the joints and
    permit block motion and deformation. Also, the
    material may fail in tension if the tensile
    stresses exceed 500 psi in any principal
    direction. The dynamic calculation is continued
    until tensile failure, block motion and tunnel
    deformation have stopped, and a steady-state
    solution is thereby obtained.

4.3 JOINT SLIDING

Peak slide displacements of 1% of the tunnel diameter are
predicted in the quasi-static solution. In a full sized tunnel,
with a diameter of 10 feet, this corresponds to 1.2 inches of
sliding.

Figure 22 shows the slide displacement along the joint as a
function of distance (scaled by tunnel radius) from the tunnel
axis. The sliding is a maximum at about one radius along the
joints nearest the tunnel crown and invert (Joints 3 and 9 in
Figure 22).

4.4 TENSILE CRACKING

The tensile cracking is closely related to the relative slide
displacements across the joints. When slipping occurs across a
joint, the plates of rock separated by the joints act as beams.

45

Figure 22. Slide Displacement Along the Various Joints Versus Distance Along the Joint for Quasi-Static Calculation of a Small-Scale Model in DIABLO HAWK.

The presence of the unlined tunnel removes localized support, and beam bending leads to tensile stresses and fracture.

The crack pattern obtained in the numerical solution is shown in Figure 23. The "beams" terminating in the opening show significant cracking of the unsupported cantilevered ends.

4.5 TUNNEL CLOSURE AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTAL DATA

The tunnel closure predictions are shown on Figure 24. The closure along the vertical axis (i.e., crown-invert) is approximately 0.5%. The maximum closure of 1.2% is located at $\theta = 30°$.

Figure 24 shows a comparison of the actual and predicted tunnel closure (as a % of the diameter) versus tunnel angle. The agreement is quite good except near the crown-invert ($\theta = 0°$ and 180°). The experimental data show a 1.6% closure at the crown-invert compared to a 0.5% predicted value. This difference is probably due to the moderate sliding on the joints and associated tensile failure and relaxation which occurs in the calculations, but not in the experiment.

In the quasi-static calculation, tensile cracking occurs after the joints are "unlocked" and joint sliding begins (see Section 4.4 and Figure 22). Tensile failure is not evident in the post-shot experimental model (Figure 25). If the metal casing (which is not modeled in the calculation) reduced the sliding on the joints, or if the actual joints are stronger (higher cohesion and/or higher coefficient of friction) than used in the calculation, then there would be less block motion in the experiment, and therefore there would also be less tensile failure.

Figure 25 shows the post-shot experimental model. Note the deformation of the thin (.003 inch) metal casing (or liner) surrounding the foam. This casing may have inhibited sliding

47

Figure 23. Final Tensile Crack Pattern from Quasi-Static Calculation of Small-Scale Model in DIABLO HAWK.

Figure 24. Comparison of Experimental Data and Prediction for the Tunnel Closure $\left(\frac{\Delta D}{D}\right)$ versus Tunnel Angle for the Small-Scale DIABLO HAWK Model S-D1-2-5.

49

WORKING POINT

Figure 25. Post-Shot Experimental Model S-101-2-5.

along the joints. The surface deformation occurs primarily in the _____ _____ _____ _____ _____, _____ _____. Thus, "block motion" has occurred as predicted. A quantitative description from the small-scale model of the amount of relative displacement across the joints is highly desirable for comparisons with the WAVE-L code predictions of Figure 22.

APPENDIX A

JOINT ACTIVATION CONDITIONS NEAR A CYLINDRICAL TUNNEL

The relationships between the principal stress components (σ_1, σ_2), joint and tunnel angles (α, β), and constitutive activation properties will be obtained using a Mohr diagram (Ref. 8). The joint constitutive model is specified by

$$|\tau|_{max} = \tau_o + \mu\sigma_n$$

or   (A-1)

$$|\tau|_{max} = \tau_o + (\tan\phi)\sigma_n$$

where

$|\tau|_{max}$ = the maximum allowable shear stress on the joint

σ_n = the normal stress on the joint

τ_o = the joint cohesion

$\mu = \tan\phi$ is the coefficient of friction and ϕ is the angle of friction.

Figure A-1 (page 57) is a Mohr diagram which shows (1) the shear stress τ and normal stress σ_n for the joint constitutive model (Equation A-1), and (2) the possible shear and normal stress states corresponding to the principal stresses σ_1 and σ_2. The following sketch (page 54) indicates the geometrical interpretation of the Mohr diagram in terms of the stresses on a joint near a tunnel surface:

53

Mohr Diagram for σ_1 and Principal Stresses

Shear and normal stress on joint oriented at angle to tunnel normal.

Shear Stress

Normal Stress

tangential stress on tunnel

normal stress on tunnel

tunnel

Joint activation will commence when the shear and normal stresses on a joint satisfy the joint constitutive relationship of Equation A-1. Thus, in Figure A-1, the joint activation conditions are satisfied for $\alpha = \alpha_1$ and $\alpha = \alpha_2$. Letting ϕ be the symbol for the critical joint activation angle (either ϕ_1 or ϕ_2), then the geometry of Figure A-1 imples

$$\frac{\sin \phi}{R} = \frac{\sin(2\alpha - \phi)}{H}$$

or

$$\frac{\sin \phi}{\left(\frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{2}\right)} = \frac{\sin(2\alpha - \phi)}{\left(\frac{C_O}{H} + \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma_3}{2}\right)}$$

(A-2)

54

Doing the algebra and solving for σ_2, we find,

$$\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \left(\frac{\sin(2\psi-\phi) + \sin \phi}{\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin \phi}\right) + \frac{2\tau_o}{\mu} \left(\frac{\sin \phi}{\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin \phi}\right) \quad (A-3)$$

Equation A-3 relates the two principal stresses such that an oriented joint (with angle ψ between the tunnel normal and the joint) will lead to joint activation. A more physical and useful relationship for a plane stress wave engulfing a tunnel can be obtained on a tunnel surface.

On an tunnel surface, one principal stress component vanishes; i.e., $\sigma_1 = 0$. Thus, the tangential stress, σ_2, on the tunnel surface for joint activation is

$$\sigma_2 = \frac{2\tau_o}{\mu} \left(\frac{\sin \phi}{\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin \phi}\right) = \frac{2\tau_o \cos \phi}{\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin \phi} \quad (A-4)$$

When a plane wave engulfs a tunnel, however, the tangential s~c varies with the angle on the tunnel surface as illustrated in the following sketch:

$$A(\theta) = 2 - [1 + 2\cos(2\theta)] \left(\frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu}\right)$$

Relationship Between Tangential Stress, σ_2, and Loading Stress, σ_{load}, on Tunnel Surface

In the sketch, $A(\beta)$ is the amplification factor of the σ_{load} wave. $A(\beta)$ depends on the angle β on the tunnel surface and on the elastic Poisson's Ratio (ν) of the media. The derivation for $A(\beta)$ can be obtained by superposition of elastic solutions derived in Reference 8. Figure 5 (in body of report) shows $A(\beta)$ for $\nu = .25$ and $.4$.

Since $\sigma_1 = 0$ and $\sigma_2 = A(\beta)$, σ_{load}, Equation A-4 shows that

$$\sigma_{load} = \frac{\sigma_2}{A(\beta)} = \frac{2\tau_o \cos \phi}{[\sin(2\psi-\phi) - \sin \phi]A(\beta)} \qquad (A-5)$$

where

$$A(\beta) = 2 - [1 + 2\cos(2\beta)] \frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu}$$

This is the activation stress load relationship (Equation 1) used in the report.

$$R = \frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1}{2}$$

$$H = \frac{\tau_o}{\mu} + \sigma_1 + R = \frac{\tau_o}{\mu} + \frac{\sigma_2 + \sigma_1}{2}$$



Figure A-1. Mohr Diagram Relating the Shear Stress (τ) and Normal Stress (σ_n) for a Typical Stress State Which Satisfies the Incipient Joint Slippage Criteria at $\theta = \psi_1$ and $\theta = \psi_2$.

REFERENCES

1. S. E. Blouin, "Data Report, DATEX II," AFWL-TR-69-149,
    January 1970.

2. M. Rosenblatt and K. N. Kreyenhagen, "Free Field Motions
    in Jointed Media," DNA 2769F, November 1971.

3. M. Rosenblatt, G. E. Eggum, Y. M. Ito and K. N. Kreyenhagen,
    "Interactions of Stress Waves with Deeply-Buried Tunnels in
    Geologies with Cracks and Discontinuities," DNA 4398F,
    June 1975.

4. B. S. Holmes and H. E. Lindberg, "Small-Model Hardened
    Structures Experiments for Diablo Hawk," SRI77-27,
    January 1977.

5. M. L. Wilkins, "Calculation of Elastic-Plastic Flow,"
    UCRL-7322, Revision 1, January 1969.

6. M. Rosenblatt, G. E. Eggum, L. A. DeAngelo and K. N.
    Kreyenhagen, "Numerical Investigation of Water Drop Erosion
    Mechanisms in Infrared-Transparent Materials," AFML-TR-76-193,
    December 1976.

7. D. Stowe, Personal Communication, U.S. Army Engineer Water-
    ways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

8. S. Timoshenko and J. Goddier, Theory of Elasticity, Third
    Edition, McGraw Hill, 1970.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Assistant to the Secretary of Defense
Atomic Energy
    ATTN: Executive Assistant

Defense Intelligence Agency
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: DB-4C

Defense Nuclear Agency
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___

Defense Technical Information Center

Field Command
Defense Nuclear Agency
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___

Field Command
Defense Nuclear Agency
Livermore Branch
    ATTN: ___

___
Defense Nuclear Agency
    ATTN: ___

    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: Tech Info Library

___
    ATTN: ___

___

___

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (Continued)

___ Army Concepts Analysis Agency
    ATTN: ___

___ Army Engineer Center
    ATTN: ___

___ Army Engineer ___
    ATTN: ___

___ Army ___
    ATTN: ___

___ Army ___
    ATTN: ___

___ Army ___ Information ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: Library
    ATTN: ___
    ATTN: ___

___ Army Nuclear ___
    ATTN: Library

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Chief of Naval Operations
Department of the Navy
    ATTN: ___

Naval Construction Battalion Center
    ATTN: ___

Naval Electronic Systems Command
    ATTN: ___

Naval Postgraduate School
    ATTN: Code 1424, Library

Naval Research Laboratory
    ATTN: ___

Naval Surface Weapons Center
    ATTN: Tech Lib & Info Svcs Branch

Naval War College
    ATTN: Code E-11

Strategic Systems Project Office
Department of the Navy
    ATTN: ___

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Air Force Institute of Technology
Air University
    ATTN: Library

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE (Continued)

Air Force Weapons Laboratory
Air Force Systems Command
    ATTN: NTE, M. Plamondon
    ATTN: NT, D. Payton
    ATTN: SUL

Air University Library
Department of the Air Force
    ATTN: AUL/LSE

Assistant Chief of Staff
Studies & Analyses
Department of the Air Force
    ATTN: AF/SASM
    ATTN: AF/SASM, W. Adams

Ballistic Missile Office
Air Force Systems Command
    ATTN: MNN
    ATTN: MNNH

Deputy Chief of Staff
Operations Plans and Readiness
Department of the Air Force
    ATTN: AFXODC

Deputy Chief of Staff
Research, Development, & Acq
Department of the Air Force
    ATTN: AFRDQI

Foreign Technology Division
Air Force Systems Command
    ATTN: NIIS Library

Strategic Air Command
Department of the Air Force
    ATTN: XPFS
    ATTN: NRI-STINFO Library

OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Central Intelligence Agency
    ATTN: OSWR/NED

Department of the Interior
Bureau of Mines
    ATTN: Tech Lib

Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey
    ATTN: R. Carroll
    ATTN: W. Twenhofel

Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey
    ATTN: D. Roddy

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTORS

Lawrence Livermore National Lab
    ATTN: Technical Info Dept Library
    ATTN: L-21, D. Oakley
    ATTN: G. Smith
    ATTN: H. Heard

Oak Ridge National Laboratory
    ATTN: Central Research Library

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Los Alamos National Scientific Lab
    ATTN: B. Killian
    ATTN: J. Johnson
    ATTN: MS 364
    ATTN: L. Germaine

Sandia Laboratories
Livermore Laboratory
    ATTN: Library & Security Classification Div.

Sandia National Lab
    ATTN: L. Hill
    ATTN: 3141

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Aerospace Corp.
    ATTN: P. Mathur
    ATTN: Technical Information Services

Agbabian Associates
    ATTN: M. Balachanda
    ATTN: C. Bagge
2 cy ATTN: M. Agbabian

Applied Theory, Inc.
2 cy ATTN: J. Trulio

AVCO Research & Systems Group
    ATTN: Library A830

BDM Corp.
    ATTN: Corporate Library
    ATTN: T. Neighbors

Boeing Co.
    ATTN: T. Berg
    ATTN: R. Dyrdahl
    ATTN: M/S 42/37, K. Friddell
    ATTN: H. Leistner
    ATTN: Aerospace Library
    ATTN: J. Wooster

California Institute of Technology
    ATTN: D. Anderson

California Research & Technology, Inc.
    ATTN: Library
    ATTN: S. Schuster
    ATTN: K. Kreyenhagen
4 cy ATTN: M. Rosenblatt
4 cy ATTN: L. DeAngelo

California Research & Technology, Inc.
    ATTN: D. Orphal

University of California
    ATTN: N. Cook
    ATTN: R. Goodman

Calspan Corp
    ATTN: Library

University of Denver
    ATTN: J. Wisotski

EG&G Wash Analytical Svcs Ctr, Inc.
    ATTN: Library

60

Electromech Sys of New Mexico, Inc
    ATTN: R. Shunk

University of New Mexico
Civil Engineering Rsch Fac
    ATTN: N. Baum

Foster-Miller Associates, Inc
    ATTN: J. Hampson for E. Foster

Franklin Institute
    ATTN: Z. Zudans

IIT Research Institute
    ATTN: M. Johnson
    ATTN: R. Welch
    ATTN: Documents Library

Institute for Defense Analyses
    ATTN: Classified Library

J. H. Wiggins Co, Inc
    ATTN: J. Collins

Kaman AviDyne
    ATTN: Library

Kaman Sciences Corp
    ATTN: Library

Kaman TEMPO
    ATTN: DASIAC

J. D. Haltiwanger Consult Svcs
    ATTN: W. J. Haltiwanger

Lockheed Missiles & Space Co, Inc
    ATTN: Technical Information Center
    ATTN: T. Geers

Massachusetts Inst of Technology
    ATTN: W. Brace

Merritt Cases, Inc
    ATTN: J. Merritt

City College of New York
    ATTN: C. Miller

Northwestern University
    ATTN: T. Belytschko

Pacifica Terra Research Corp
    ATTN: H. Brode

Pacifica Terra Research Corp
    ATTN: R. Gormley

Pacifica Technology
    ATTN: G. Kent

Patel Enterprises, Inc
    ATTN: M. Patel

Physics International Co
    ATTN: E. Moore
    ATTN: Technical Library
    ATTN: F. Sauer

R & D Associates
    ATTN: D. Rawson
    ATTN: D. Shrinivasa
    ATTN: R. Port
    ATTN: J. Lewis
    ATTN: Technical Information Center
    ATTN: P. Haas

Rand Corp
    ATTN: A. Laupa

Science Applications, Inc
    ATTN: Technical Library

Science Applications, Inc
    ATTN: Technical Library

Science Applications, Inc
    ATTN: W. Layson

Southwest Research Institute
    ATTN: A. Wenzel
    ATTN: W. Baker

SRI International
    ATTN: G. Abrahamson
    ATTN: H. Lindberg
    ATTN: B. Holmes

Systems, Science & Software, Inc
    ATTN: R. Duff
    ATTN: C. Archembeam
    ATTN: Library
    ATTN: D. Grine

Terra Tek, Inc
    ATTN: H. Pratt
    ATTN: Library

Texas A & M University System
    ATTN: A. Rychlik
    ATTN: J. Handin

TRW Defense & Space Sys Group
    ATTN: P. Huff
    ATTN: Technical Information Center
    ATTN: N. Lipner

TRW Defense & Space Sys Group
    ATTN: E. Wong
    ATTN: P. Dai

Universal Analytics, Inc
    ATTN: E. Field

Weidlinger Associates, Consulting Engineers
    ATTN: M. Baron
    ATTN: I. Sandler

Weidlinger Associates, Consulting Engineers
    ATTN: J. Isenberg

William Perret
    ATTN: W. Perret

DATE FILMED

8